

# SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF AMENDED BILL

Franchise Tax Board

Author: Leno Analyst: LuAnna Hass Bill Number: AB 1690

Related Bills: See Prior Analysis Telephone: 845-7478 Amended Date: September 4, 2003

Attorney: Patrick Kusiak Sponsor: \_\_\_\_\_

**SUBJECT:** Local General Income Tax/Public Safety Finance Agency

DEPARTMENT AMENDMENTS ACCEPTED. Amendments reflect suggestions of previous analysis of bill as introduced/amended \_\_\_\_\_.

AMENDMENTS IMPACT REVENUE. A new revenue estimate is provided.

☒ AMENDMENTS DID NOT RESOLVE THE DEPARTMENT'S CONCERNS stated in the previous analysis of bill as amended August 18, 2003.

☒ FURTHER AMENDMENTS NECESSARY.

DEPARTMENT POSITION CHANGED TO \_\_\_\_\_.

☒ REMAINDER OF PREVIOUS ANALYSIS OF BILL AS AMENDED August 18, 2003, STILL APPLIES.

OTHER - See comments below.

## SUMMARY

This bill would give the Franchise Tax Board (FTB) the authority to administer and collect a local income tax where voters approve the tax.

This bill also would add provisions regarding public safety finance agencies and property taxes. These changes do not affect the department and are not discussed in this analysis.

## SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS

The September 4, 2003, amendments provide clarification regarding FTB's costs to administer this bill and any agreement required between FTB and a county or city and county (hereinafter referred to for ease of discussion as "county") that enacts a local income tax. Specifically, the amendments would require that any agreement between FTB and a county shall provide that FTB must receive an amount equal to all start-up costs that would be necessary to administer a local income tax before FTB incurs any costs associated with the activities necessary to implement this bill. Start-up costs would include, but are not limited to, costs associated with the purchasing of equipment, the development of processes, and labor.

For convenience, the existing concerns, fiscal, and economic impacts are provided below. The remainder of the department's analysis of the bill as amended August 18, 2003, still applies.

Board Position:

<input type="checkbox"/> S	<input type="checkbox"/> NA	<input type="checkbox"/> NP
<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> O	<input type="checkbox"/> NAR
<input type="checkbox"/> N	<input type="checkbox"/> OUA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PENDING

Legislative Director

Date

Brian Putler

9/9/03

## **POSITION**

Pending.

## **ANALYSIS**

### IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

This bill would have a significant impact upon the department. As described below under "Fiscal Impact," the department would incur costs to change the tax forms, instructions and booklets and to program, test, and maintain departmental systems. In addition, the department has identified the following concerns:

This bill would require FTB to estimate, based on historical data, the amount of local general tax to be collected in the first 12 months in which the tax is imposed. Generally, estimates of revenue projections are made by a state agency other than FTB that has the appropriate information and systems to make such estimates. If FTB were required to estimate the local income tax that could be collected, the methodology would be imprecise and could result in substantial errors for specific localities.

In addition, this bill requires FTB to transmit the local income taxes collected within 60 days after processing the return or collecting the tax, whichever is later. Assuming the taxpayer were to self-assess the local income tax on the personal income tax (PIT) return, FTB receives PIT returns and payments daily from January through April 15<sup>th</sup> and, for taxpayers with an extension, through October 15<sup>th</sup>. However, in order to ease administration for FTB, the department would likely remit the funds weekly or monthly, which would have a minor impact on current fiscal operations.

### TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Amendment 1 is provided as a technical amendment to correct a cross-reference within the provisions of the Revenue and Taxation Code relating to local income tax.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

Below is a general description of additional work that would be required by the department in order to administer a local income tax program:

- FTB would incur significant system programming hours. The department would need to create codes and program the systems to identify and calculate the tax for each county.
- The amount of the local income tax reported on a return would be adjusted in those instances where a mathematical correction is made to a return during processing that would change a taxpayer's PIT liability. The taxpayer would either get a reduced refund or be billed for the additional local income tax.
- The department would need to significantly modify the billing system for those taxpayers who fail to report or pay the local income tax.
- All of the information relating to the local income tax would need to be captured and retained in the department's systems.

- Although a worksheet and instructions would be provided in the PIT booklet, the department anticipates an increase in taxpayer contacts to the department for assistance in calculating the local income tax.
- There would be an increase in the department's collection activities for those taxpayers who fail or refuse to report or pay a local income tax.

For purposes of this estimate, the department used the San Diego County population that filed approximately 1.1 million PIT returns. As a result, the department has identified a preliminary implementation cost estimate of \$3.5 - \$3.7 million. Total costs include changes to the tax forms, instructions and booklets, programming, testing, and maintaining departmental systems, processing hours, remittance of the local income tax to the appropriate county, and the development and negotiation of agreements to ensure taxpayer privacy and non-disclosure of taxpayer information. Of the \$3.5 - \$3.7 million estimated above, approximately \$2.4 million is for systems updates and the printing of PIT booklets to include a new worksheet and the various codes. The \$2.4 million cost is not based on the population of a specific county and would be consistent regardless of the number of counties that may enact a local income tax. Any cost in excess of the \$2.4 million would be based on the population of a specific county. Therefore, the department's cost could increase significantly depending on the number and population of counties or cities and counties that may enact a local income tax.

To ensure the department has the funding to implement this bill, the department would suggest the author add appropriation language to this bill that would cover the start-up costs of implementation. At a minimum, department staff suggests appropriation language that would provide FTB \$100,000 for the 2003/2004 fiscal year to create or modify a system to estimate the local income tax that could be collected and \$2.3 million for the 2004/2005 fiscal year due to the significant tax forms changes and the programming and testing effort required. The department is currently working on Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) for the 2004/2005 fiscal year and deficiency requests for the 2003/2004 fiscal year. However, absent an appropriation or Department of Finance approval of a BCP for the 2004/2005 fiscal year or a deficiency request for the 2003/2004 fiscal year, the department would be required to redirect staff from other revenue generating activities of the department, such as collections administration or audit, to administer this bill.

## **ECONOMIC IMPACT**

This bill would not impact the state's income tax revenue.

## **ARGUMENTS/POLICY CONCERNS**

This bill could be seen to result in inequitable treatment between classes of taxpayers. For example, the local income tax under this bill would not be levied against 1) individuals who do not have a PIT filing requirement because they do not meet the income thresholds for filing a PIT return, or 2) all businesses and corporations that do business within the area of the local income tax, even though everyone within the area would realize the benefits of the public safety finance agency.

This bill would authorize the imposition of a local income tax upon the taxable income of any person who is a resident of that locality and the tax may not exceed an amount equal to the net tax multiplied by 10% depending on the taxpayer's locale. However, state tax law allows taxpayers to claim certain tax credits that are used to reduce the taxpayer's tax liability dollar-for-dollar.

For example an individual with taxable income of \$100,000 and one personal exemption would have a PIT net tax of \$7,342. If the taxpayer resided in a county that imposed a local general tax of 10%, the local general tax amount would be \$734. That same taxpayer could have credits equaling \$1,000, which would reduce their tax to \$6,342, but their local income tax would still be \$734. Calculating the local tax based on net tax could give the appearance that taxpayers would be paying more than the 10% of net tax liability.

Since this bill does not currently contain a provision to require employers to increase withholding from an employee's (taxpayer's) wages, it is possible that a taxpayer who resides in a county that enacts a local income tax would not have sufficient withholding to cover both his or her PIT liability and the local income tax liability for a taxable year. As a result, the taxpayer may be subject to underpayment penalties.

The majority of tax returns are filed on a calendar-year basis. The local income tax would be reported on tax returns filed after the close of that calendar year. For fiscal purposes, ideally, the estimate of local income tax and the collection of the tax would be made for the same taxable year as the tax is reported on the return. However, the timeliness of the transfer of money to the local jurisdiction may be an issue. Local jurisdictions generally operate on a fiscal year basis. For those returns filed and processed by April 15<sup>th</sup> the local jurisdiction would likely receive the transfer of tax before the end of one fiscal year. For tax returns filed by the extended due date in October, the local income tax amounts would be transferred to the local jurisdiction in the next fiscal year.

## **LEGISLATIVE STAFF CONTACT**

LuAnna Hass  
Franchise Tax Board  
845-7478  
[LuAnna.Hass@ftb.ca.gov](mailto:LuAnna.Hass@ftb.ca.gov)

Brian Putler  
Franchise Tax Board  
845-6333  
[Brian.Putler@ftb.ca.gov](mailto:Brian.Putler@ftb.ca.gov)

Analyst	LuAnna Hass
Telephone #	845-7478
Attorney	Patrick Kusiak

FRANCHISE TAX BOARD'S  
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO AB 1690  
As Amended September 4, 2003

AMENDMENT 1

On page 12, line 16, strikeout "This section" and insert:

Section 17041.5